REMARKS

Applicants have received and carefully reviewed the Final Office Action mailed March 8, 2007 and the Advisory Action mailed on May 14, 2007. Claims 1, 40, 42, and 44-45 and 50 remain pending, with all other claims cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

In the previous Amendment After Final, Applicants submitted amendments to previously pending claims in the belief that these amendments could be entered After Final. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that some of those amendments would raise new issues and/or require additional search. Applicants are submitting this amendment such that claims which were indicated as allowable in the Advisory Action can issue.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the exchange of telephone messages between Applicants' attorney and the Examiner. Applicants had enquired as to whether non-entry of the first Amendment After Final would require resubmission of the Terminal Disclaimer with this paper. In a message left on May 31, 2007, the Examiner indicated that resubmission of the terminal disclaimer was not necessary.

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

In Paragraph 2 of the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 46 has been cancelled without prejudice. The rejection was directed to the use of a range of 3 Volts to 2000 Volts. The Examiner identified a range of about 800 volts to 2000 volts that was supported in the original disclosure. In light thereof, Applicants submitted an amended claim 1 in the first Amendment After Final. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if resubmitted in a separate, timely amendment. The above amendment to claim 1 is the same as was previously submitted. Therefore it is believed that the rejection is overcome.

In Paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action, claims 49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,385,574 to Hauser et al. In Paragraph 6 of the Final Office Action, claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauser et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,643,323 to Kroll et al. In Paragraph 7 of the Final Office Action, claims 46-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hauser et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,215,081 to Ostroff. In Paragraph 8 of the Final Office Action, claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hauser et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,709,709 to Kroll. Each of these claims has been cancelled without prejudice, rendering the rejections moot.

In Paragraph 10 of the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 46-47 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 46-47 have been cancelled without prejudice, rendering a portion of the rejection moot. Applicants submitted a Terminal Disclaimer that overcame the rejection with the first Amendment After Final. In her telephone message, the Examiner indicated that the previously submitted terminal disclaimer had been accepted. Therefore Applicants understand that this rejection has been overcome with respect to claim 1.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 40, 42, 44-45 and 50 in both the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,

Gust H. Bardy et al.

By their Attorney,

Date:

David M. Crompton, Reg. No. 36,772 CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC

1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800

Minneapolis, MN 55403-2420 Telephone: (612) 677-9050

Facsimile: (612) 359-9349